

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
August 19, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group (CRWG) meeting on August 19, 2003 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Cultural Resources Goals and Resource Actions Worksheet
Attachment 4	2004 Draft Schedule for Plenary and Work Group Meetings

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the CRWG meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Action Items – July 22, 2003 Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting

A summary of the July 22, 2003 CRWG meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #C53:	Confirm C004 includes kiosks–trailhead, interpretive, displays.
Status:	Chris Acken of DWR added this language to the worksheet and Resource Action Identification Form. She provided copies of the revised worksheet at this meeting (see summary of discussion below).
Action Item #C54:	Send revised tables to distribution list.
Status:	DWR distributed revised tables.
Action Item # C55:	Send roster via regular mail to Ellen Clark.
Status:	The Facilitator provided the roster to Ellen at the July CRWG meeting.

Study Plan Implementation Update

Dale Hoffman-Floerke of DWR updated the CRWG on the on-going studies. She informed the CRWG that the consultants are still doing data entry for the archaeology tasks. They are developing a proposal for the evaluation of historic era sites and are currently incorporating DWR comments. She told the CRWG that the consultants are also working on getting final inventory reports completed. She announced that the ethnographers have sent to the tribes packets that include interviews conducted during the study. Patty Reece Allen reported that Berry Creek Rancheria had received their packet of interview transcriptions. Juanita Anglin representing the Cherokee stated that their tribal interviewees have refused to sign their individual transcriptions until the federal government identifies them as a federally recognized tribe in Oroville.

One participant asked what was contained in each interview packet. Dale responded that the packet contains signed transcriptions of each interview conducted with members of the specific tribe to which the packet is sent.

Dale told the CRWG that Helen McCarthy is still analyzing the ethnographic data. She added that the consultants are currently conducting background research on the hydroelectric facility itself from a historical perspective. One participant asked if the cultural surveys of recreational areas around the lake were finished. Dale responded that those surveys have been completed.

Maidu Advisory Council Update

The Facilitator announced that since the Maidu Advisory Council has not met since the last CRWG there would be no update.

Resource Action Discussion

The Facilitator reviewed the Resource Action (RA) discussion from July's CRWG meeting and distributed a Cultural Resources Goals and Resource Actions Worksheet (Attachment 3). She told the group that the tables they have been developing would be converted into a matrix format, similar to other work groups', to help categorize the individual RAs. The CRWG reviewed and discussed additional information provided by participants related to specific RAs included in the worksheet.

Art Angle asked if a final Area of Potential Effect (APE) had been determined. Steve Heipel with the consulting team reminded Art that they have agreed to use a working APE that follows existing FERC project boundaries with the understanding that the boundaries could shift if information suggests it is appropriate or necessary to change. Art suggested that the Native American community should look at the areas adjacent to the current APE because some of those areas have significance to them. Eric Ritter representing BLM added that the archaeological APE would likely differ from an APE for traditional cultural properties.

Art asked whether a map showing specific areas of sensitivity would be distributed to the public. Steve Heipel responded that any map distributed to the public would show general areas of sensitivity but would not identify site-specific information. The Facilitator added that such a map would be helpful to other work groups while locating additional activities or facilities as part of the relicensing process. One participant inquired about the inclusion of Bald Mountain in studies. Steve Heipel noted that the area is private property and thus not included in the survey work; however, Helen McCarthy has been tracking its significance to the local tribes in her studies.

The CRWG discussed the schedule and tasks ahead, and the Facilitator explained that the schedule is being driven by the need to file a timely application. She told the CRWG that the RAs agreed on by the CRWG for further analysis would be forwarded to the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) team for inclusion in the environmental document, which will be submitted to FERC with the license application. The Facilitator stressed the need to categorize the RAs in a matrix similar to the matrix being used by the other work groups. She described the matrix originally developed by the Environmental Work Group and displayed a sample prepared by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group. She explained that while all of the work groups are using the same framework, their column headings differ slightly to accommodate their specific needs.

The Facilitator suggested that DWR and the consulting team develop a matrix for the CRWG, populated with those RAs for which there are Resource Action Identification Forms. The CRWG would then review the matrix at the next CRWG meeting. She stressed the importance of getting together as much information as soon as possible to forward to the PDEA group so they can begin their analysis. She said the goal is to provide FERC with enough information in the PDEA for FERC to develop a NEPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Next Meeting and Next Steps

The Facilitator distributed a revised calendar of Plenary and Work Group meetings for 2004 (Attachment 4) and announced that the next CRWG meeting would be as follows:

Date: September 16, 2003
Time: 5:30 – 8:30 p.m.
Location: To be determined

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the CRWG includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

#C56: Confirm whether the Cherokee interviews were sent to Cherokee Nation.
Responsible: DWR
Due Date: September 2003

#C57: Send a copy of Thorne's report to Eric Ritter.
Responsible: DWR
Due Date: September 2003

#C58: Email completed Resource Action Identification Forms to Janis Offermann and copy to Chris Acken.
Responsible: CRWG
Due Date: September 2003